

THE
Middle-Way

In One paper of
THE COVENANTS,
LAW and GOSPEL.

With Indifferency between the
LEGALIST & ANTINOMIAN.

By J. H.

Doing nothing by Partiality,

L O N D O N,

Printed for T. Baskhurst, at the Bible and Three
Crowns in Cheap-side, 1674.

THE

Middle-West

AMERICAN

W. and G. L.

W. and G. L.

W. and G. L.

Printed for the Government at the Bible and Tract
Stores in London, 1874.



O F

The Covenants.

IT is one reason of my sending out these sheets thus in single Papers, that I may have the opportunity my self of Reflexion. If any thing be wanting I may supply it; where I am in the dark I may explain it, or call for Light; If I erre, I may correct it, and put my self at ease still when I need, as to the whole. It is verily a foolish thing I count for any man to think that he can speak or write so, as what he hath once spoken or written cannot be mended. When we change our thoughts every day and week in our private Studies, what a vain resolution is it, that because we have Preached or Printed thus, the shutters must be drawn up presently, and no more Light be let, to come in upon us. For my part I declare, I will never Preach or Print upon such termes, but upon these: That I may be mistaken; That I may acknowledge it, if I be convinced. That I may therefore be controuled, and have leave to be indifferent to my own opinion, as to anothers.

Two Papers I have sent out already.

The first (or that which in order should be first) is of *Election and Redemption*, wherein I observe some things to be misplaced at the Press, but so long as the things be put in, and my notion proposed, I am sollicitous about nothing else. That God would have all to be saved, and therefore prepares that grace for all that is *sufficient*, which is his *antecedent will*: and that then he foresees who they be that will comply with that grace and and who not, and by his *consequent will* decrees the one to *salvation*, and the other to *damnation*, is that Doctrin in the maine, that is the *Rachel* of the *Schools*. For the latter part whereof, I have given my thoughts in that paper: the former part requires a little further consideration. That the goodness of God is advanced towards all, I like well, and that they lay the blame on man only that he perishes, and that they are so careful against *Pelagius*, for therefore do they bring in a *sufficient* grace for all, because man shall be allowed him to do nothing that disposes him to conversion or justification by his *own strength* without grace; nevertheless whether this *sufficient* grace of theirs is to pass or not, is the question. There is the *universal concurrence* of God with man in all his acts as the first cause, in whom we live and move and have our being: and there is that influx or assistance of his, we call *Grace*. It would be known in the first place, what is the difference between these. That assistance of God which goes to the acts of *Nature*, and the preservation thereof, is the *common concurrence* of his *Providence*, that assistance of his which goes to the production of acts *above Nature*, is called *Grace*. By *Nature* we mean corrupt *Nature*, and by acts *above Nature* we mean such acts as we should not do according to our natural inclination, if it were not for supernatural help, that is, some further operation or influence on us from God then that which goes only to our natural preservation. *Grace* then in short is that Divine assistance which *Elevates* *Nature*, and *heales* it. This *Grace* is twofold, the Divine motion, or habitual disposition; *habitualis gratia*, or *divina motio*; the infused habit, or Divine operation. It is said now in the *Schools* that there is this difference between *infused* habits, and *acquired*, that when the one do introduce only a *facility* to the action but presupposes the power, the other

Other do bring the power it self, as without which we can do nothing. This is spoken I count very agreeably to the Scripture; which sets forth man in his natural state as *dead in sin*, and the work of Grace by *regeneration* and *new life*, with many the like expressions: nevertheless, as there must be some limits fixt for the right interpretation of such places which in effect must come to that which I have given in my first paper, (that there is indeed such an *indisposition* on all men through original corruption, as that there is no man ever *does, did, or will* repent, do his duty, and *live*, but it is, was, and must be through Gods especial Grace, and yet are we to account for all that, that they *have power*, that they *may* if they *will*, that the covenant of grace requires not any thing which is impossible, for both these are to be held): So must I crave liberty to enter my different opinion. It was *Pelagius* his conceit (*I have noted in one of my other papers*) that grace served only to help the power, when *St. Augustine* proves that it *inclines the will*, and works in us the deed: my thoughts now lye partly between both, that the *Posse* or Power indeed is of *Nature*, and Grace or the operation of God is that which draws that power into the Will, or *Act*; that is makes us willing; This act of the Will laies an impression on the soul inclining it to the like acts; These acts iterated turns that inclination to an habit, that is Habitual grace, *infused* if you please, *per modum acquisitorum*. The *agere*, the act must presuppose the *posse*, the power. That's certain. If the habit then brought the power, the *Divine motion*, or preventing grace which goes before the *habit*, did nothing. You will say, There is a double power, a *remote* or *next* power. The remote power is of nature, but the next power is of grace, and sufficient grace gives to all a next power. Let me ask you then, whether there be any further grace after we have the next power, to make us willing, or to give us also the will and deed. If you grant it, you may make the most of your *sufficient* grace, I will not quarrel with you for it: But when the *posse* (the power) is of nature, and the Will and Deed is of that grace which is more than *sufficient*, I would faine know why nature and effectual grace alone should not serve the turn, and
whether

whether sufficient grace over and above these is not indeed more than needs? Here I stick where I left.

The second paper is of *Justification*, and of this I count there are two parts. The one is, a *reconciliation of St. James and Paul*, and so of *faith and works* in that point: which I must needs say, having lain in my thoughts (& the main notion in Paper by me) this 16 or 18 Years or upwards, I cannot but be very thoroughly satisfied with, and much the rather, when I see the same growing up in late Books; as particularly in those most judicious temperate *Theses of Le Blanc*, and Mr. *Trumans Great Propitiation*. The other is concerning the *imputation of Christs Righteousness*, wherein I will confess, though in my judgment I am perswaded that what I have writ is the truth, and it is nothing but truth that made me write it: yet does my heart a little misgive me, that it were better to let pious men alone to such apprehensions as they have imbibed, though mingled with much darkness and some error, in such a point as this, where so much of their peace and life is bound up, then to offer them any unsettlement by clearer light, though I were able indeed to bring it to them. I may be allowed to be sorry if I *offend* any body, but I ought to have a care I *stumble* none, who are good men and live godly; Neither would I streighten my own soul. If there be any thing more therefore in the imputation of Christs righteousness then I have expressed in that paper, which I know not, I doe not part with my portion in it, I protest thus much, but will rather renounce all upon the conviction to cleave to it.

That Christs righteousness does justify us *from the Law*, and so from sin, and from condemnation, I do hold no less then others: but that Christs righteousness does justify us *by the Law*, is an overgrown conception. It is certain, that no works of man be we never so holy, are able to stand before God in his disstrict judgment, that is, if he should deal with us according to the exact justice of the Law without shewing us any mercy, which will be acknowledged by *Protestants and Papists*, who are ready to pray both with *David*, *Enter not into judgment with*

with thy servants O Lord, for in thy sight shall no flesh living be justified. If any Papist then shall think that mans righteousness is made so perfect by Christs merits: or, any Protestants that Christs righteousness it self is so made ours, as that we are justified by the Law, upon that account, they are both mistaken. This is the only true extremitie on both sides: for it is not by the Law, but by Faith; by the Evangelical covenant, or by Grace that we are justified. *We are not under the Law*, sayes the Apostle, *but under grace*. It is enough for a poor sinner to have a righteousness imputed to him *without works*, and that he is pardoned: but to have a righteousness imputed to him *with works*, is more then we can find to be allowed him. Christs righteousness is such, and to have that made ours *in it self*, or so, as that in Gods reckoning we must be as righteous as he, I must needs say, it is not harder perhaps to believe that the bread is turned into Christs body (where we have a text for it) in the Sacrament: then to believe such a conceit (for which we have no Scripture at all) in the matter of Justification. What then? Do I deny Imputation? No, but I explain it. It is by the righteousness of Christ, *not inherent in us*, our Divines will say Ordinarily, *but imputed to us*, that we are justified. And what if I thus interpret this for them, that is, *not as if we had done in his person what Christ did*, but by his righteousness *made ours* in the effects only? So the very Learned Bishop Forbs expressly, *Hoc est, Quoad effectum & fructum* (See *Considerationes modestæ. De justificatione, l. 2. c. 2.*) I will use the same words as they use, but I am not bound to the same construction. Even as I will speak of mans insufficiency (I mentioned before) as other Divines do, and as the Scriptures do, that *we can do nothing*: but I will keep the due interpretation. I will say *we can*, and that *we cannot*, without loss of my liberty: for I must understand it with its right measures. I will say *I can* in confession of my sin, and acknowledging God just: I will say *I cannot* in the sense of my corruption, and the imploring his grace.

Indeed a man can hardly consider the Doctrine of St. James never so little with that of Paul which is one part of my paper, but it will lead him to the other, which is to see that what our

our Protestants say ordinarily on this matter, does need a favourable exposition. It is a jejune thing, I count, to bring the great dispute that *Paul* hath with the *Jewes* about justification to this result only, whether we are justified by *Faith*, or the proper *Work* or *Fruits* of it? It is but a little more satisfactory to bring it only to this, whether it be by the observation of *Moses Law*? For though this was the occasion of the dispute, and the Apostle therefore does shew them how it was by the *Promise*, and so by *Faith* that *Abraham* and the *Jewes* themselves had life, and not by the *Law*, which was but a *Schoolmaster* to lead them thereunto, or unto *Christ*: yet it is manifest, that he advances the point higher, while he tells them that by *Works* neither *Jew* nor *Gentile* could be justified, so that by *works* he must mean the observation of that *Law of works* which was common to both, and not *Moses Law* only: and the resolution of the dispute in both *Apostles* comes to this (as I have said) that it is by the performance of the covenant of *Grace*, and not of the covenant of *works*, or *Law of Moses*, that a man is to look for life everlasting. I must add, Nor are they to be heard in a third place, who say, that the dispute between *Paul* and the *Jewes* is neither of these, but whether we are justified by our own righteousness, or by the righteousness of *Christ*, and so resolve that it is not by any *works* which we do, even *Faith* it self as a *work*, but by the *works* *Christ* hath done for us, that is by the obedience of his life and death only. For though this be taught ordinarily by our *Protestants*, and is coincident with the first result, there is one thing I must say these *Divines* have not considered which I have offered them in my paper, that must bring them to another understanding. It is this, that the *Apostle* does indeed stand much upon the *Righteousness of God* in opposition to *works*, in the business of justification, but never opposes our *works* to the *Righteousness of Christ*: the *Righteousness of Christ* in their sense being truly a very contrary thing to the *Righteousness of God* in the sense of the *Apostle*. The righteousness of *God* according to the *Apostle*, if I may then describe it but as well as I can, and as the thing is, and a little more fully then I have in my former paper, is, on *Gods part*, his taking our human frailty or false nature

nature into that meet consideration, as not to deal with us in his strict judgment which we cannot beare, but according to his Covenant of Mercy: the righteousness, sacrifice, atonement or satisfaction of Christ being supposed as the foundation upon which his Justice does stand good, notwithstanding this consideration: And consequently on *Man's part*, this righteousness is our imperfect duty performed in sincerity according to this new Law, and so for Christ's sake accepted to Salvation. In this sense am I apt to understand that *everlasting Righteousness* which is brought in, by the Messiah, or by his covenant, in *Daniel*: and in this sense do I construe that Title, *The Lord our Righteousness*. Only when I have said in my former paper, that it is not appropriated to the second Person, I desire not to be so taken, as if I supposed that by the *Branch* in the two Texts of *Jeremy* where we find it, *Zerubbable* only was meant (though a total silence in the new Testament of so pertinent a quotation for Christ, if it were spoken of him, might well tempt *Grotius* to that interpretation) but that, the Divinity of Christ being thereby asserted, it is a Title that must belong to him as God, and not as *Second person*. For the Son is Lord, and the Father is Lord, and the Holy Ghost Lord: and yet not three Lords, but one Lord, *The Lord our Righteousness*.

There is the *uncreated, absolute* righteousness of God, which is the Divine essence it self, for as God is *Truth* in the abstract, so is he *Righteousness*: or the *created, relative* righteousness of God, that is his righteousness set forth in relation to us, which consists in his dealing with us as his Creatures according to our conditions. This *relative* righteousness then is double. The *Righteousness* or *Justice* of God according to the Covenant of works: and the righteousness or equity of God according to the Covenant of grace. The one I count to be that our Divines call his *Strict*: the other his *Paternal Justice*. When God made man at first and gave him the Law of his Creation, he was to deal with him according to this perfect Law, and it was but equal according to his perfect state, and this being the original righteousness (as I may say) of God in relation to us, there are none of us but do find some sense of it in our hearts, that makes us not so much only to fear, as to be afraid of him

under that apprehension. But there is another *righteousness* then this, which was ever afoot in the world since the promise of the *womans seed*, or else there were no man could have bin Saved, though it be said to be now *manifested* (as brought in, in *Daniels* phrase) because the reason upon which it is founded, that is mans reconciliation to God by Christ, is revealed by the Gospel, and this is the *righteousness of God* opposed to *works* (or to his strict Justice which he was bound to exercise according to the *Covenant of works*) that is so magnified by the Apostle. And here now is a distinction to be used which I want Termes to express. For this righteousness of God must be considered *with regard to himself*, which is his dealing with us according to the *Covenant of Faith* for Christs sake, when he might deale with us according to the *Covenant of Nature* if he would: and *with regard to us*, or to the condition upon which he does so mercifully deale with us. As the *Love of God* is taken in Scripture both for his *Love towards us*, and our *Love of him*: So is the *Righteousness of God* taken for both these, his dealing with us according to this covenant, and the condition on our part which he accepts. And hence is it, that when it is called the *Righteousness of God* in one place, it is called the *Righteousness of Faith* in another; and in a third, the *Righteousness which is of God by Faith*. Now when it is our faith, our repentance, our new obedience which is the *Righteousness of God* it self (taken—help me to two Termes) whereby we are justified in opposition to the *works of the Law*, which no man can perform to be justified by them: and our Divines by *works* will understand all good works, even this faith it self as a *work* (as was said), and our Evangelical obedience, inso-much as when there is no righteousness but what is *without us* can be opposed to these, it makes them by the *Righteousness of God* to understand the *Righteousness of Christ* who is God, and by faith the righteousness of Christ apprehended by Faith, which are in good earnest conceptions so strained: it appears (if I may use these words in humility) how *being ignorant of the Righteousness of God* in the right notion, and *going about to establish* in a contrary vein to the Jews a righteousness which is not their *own* but anothers, in the stead of that which it is not, they

they have not *submitted* to the truth, in this Doctrine of Justification.

And herein now (farther) does appear the ground of reconciliation between the Papists and us upon the point. For when the one and the other (let their Books be consulted) do goe on the supposition that it is by the Law (the Law of works) that we are justified, this *Hypothesis* being removed, the opposition on both sides falls to the ground. That no man can bring or plead any such righteousness of his *own* before God as answers the Law, the Protestant must needs be in the right, and consequently if it were by the Law that we must stand or fall at his Tribunal, there was a necessity for their bringing in the righteousness of Christ made ours by faith (as they do) to justify us: but when indeed it is not so, when it is not (I say) by the Law, but by the *Covenant of Grace*, or by the *Gospel* that we are to be judged, it is some wonder to me, this plain truth should be no better understood. That Gods judging a man to have performed the condition of the covenant of grace is the accounting or declaring him righteous; and that Gods accounting a man righteous is his justification. *Let no man deceive you* (says St. John) *he that doth righteousness, is righteous*. That righteousness which makes a man righteous and denominates him righteous, is that righteousness which makes God account him righteous. But this is the righteousness which he *does*. Note it, for it is exprefs. And what righteousness is that? Why, Not the righteousness of *works* which no man *does*: but the righteousness of the Gospel, that is in the stile of the other Apostle, a righteousness *without works* (to wit, without the works of the Law, or perfect works, in the sense he sayes also God justifies the *ungodly*) so that it is by *Grace*, while it is by this *Righteousness* (which does and must lean on the merits of Christ no less then we say Faith it self does) that we are justified and saved.

That the end of Christs coming into the world, of our redemption, and the Covenant of Grace, was that we should be holy and righteous is said ordinarily by Divines according to the Scriptures, but the right and plain understanding or reason of what they say, is not so ordinary. *He hath chosen us in*

*Christ that we should be holy. He hath redeemed us from iniquity that we should be a peculiar People. We are his workmanship created unto good works in: (or through) Christ Jesus. When God made man at first and gave him a Law, it was that he should live Holy. When righteousness then was the end of his Creation and the Law thereof, how is this said to be the end of his Redemption? I answer. Righteousness (or holiness as they are one) we must know, does lye in a conformity to the Law which God gives us. There is nothing else, and nothing less then this (the full performance of a Law given) that is Righteousness. Upon this account, as soon as man once fell and broke the Law of his creation, it was impossible he should be righteous any more, unless there were a new Law brought in, in the performance whereof he might attain to that again which he had lost. Now to this end was it, that Christ came and died, this was the very main business (I count) of his Redemption, even the procuring this new Law, or another Law with lower termes, which some men performing, they do thereby become righteous, and so have righteousness, according to that Law, imputed to them for remission, and life Eternal. Here you see what that righteousness indeed is which Christ is said to bring in, and in what sense, he hath brought it in, or how such Texts (as those before) do attribute our Holiness to him. The obedience of Christs life and death, we know, was fulfilled on earth, and of this he himself hath once said, *It is finished*: But the righteousness he is said to bring in, is called an *Everlasting righteousness*. And what then can that be, but the *righteousness of the Gospel*, which upon the same account also is called the *Everlasting Gospel*? That is, because it is by this righteousness in opposition to that of the Law (or the righteousness of works) that all men from the beginning of the world to the end of it, (and so is it to be accounted ever of force) do obtain everlasting Salvation.*

I know the great difficulty of this Doctrine will lye on the point of remission. Our Divines do generally place justification in the remission of Sin; so do the *Papists* (with something else), and so have I my self after others. Nevertheless, as I remember St. *Augustine* in one place does find fault with this

in *Pelagism* : so hath the perplexity of it of late lead me into the like thoughts. The truth is, Pardon of Sin is a *benefit* unto which the justified person is adjudged, as eternal life is : but remission of Sin must not be made the *formal reason* of justification. Our Divines may define justification to be an Act of Grace whereby God gives us Eternal Life (or a right to it,) as well as, *an act of grace whereby he pardons our sins*. That act, that very only act wherein the form of justification does lye, is Gods accounting or pronouncing a man righteous, and this is a forensical act, according to Law, the Law, or Covenant of grace ; Which covenant promising *Forgiveness and Life* upon the performance of its Conditions, when a man hath performed them, he hath a right to those benefits, and when God does declare or account that a man hath performed them (which is all one as to judge him righteous), these benefits flow to him from that judgment (or are confer'd on him by that act) as *Effects* of that cause, and consequently cannot be the very act it self, which is the *cause* of them.

To forgive a mans sin, and declare him righteous are two things inconsistent one with another in the same respect, and therefore when God pronounces a man just, it is according to the *Law of Faith*, and when he pardons his Sin, it is in respect to the *Law of works*. And how then can two acts incompatable but in divers respects (*cum omne ens sit unum*) be made to enter one and the same definition ?

It is true as all agree, that there are no works that man does, or can doe, able to make God any amends for our offences, so that remission of sin must be attributed altogether to the merits of Christ in regard to the atonement made. But we must distinguish of Remission, Remission is either *Conditional* and *Universal* as it lyes in the Covenant, and is the purchase of Christ : or *Actual*, as it lyes in the application thereof to *particular* persons upon performance of the condition. When Divines do say we can doe nothing our selves for procuring reconciliation and remission, it is to be understood of Conditional universal remission. No mortal could do any thing toward the obtaining of that. *God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself not imputing their trespasses*.

But

But as for remission Actual, that man must be blind who sees not that God does every where require us to repent, believe, confess our faults, forsake them, do good works, forgive others, that we may have pardon, and be saved: Conditional pardon now is antecedent to a mans justification, and contained in our redemption. *In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of Sins.* Actual remission is subsequent to justification, for we must be supposed first to have performed the condition and be pronounced righteous, and then pardoned. When there is no remission then but what does either *goe before*, or *follow* justification, it cannot be made the very act it self of our justification.

There is one Text may be opposed. *Even as David also described the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth Righteousness without works. Saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven.* It seems that the Righteousness which Paul speaks of *without works* in the one verse, is described by pardon in the other. This I my self have alleadged, but upon farther consideration I answer. *The man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works*, or the *blessedness of that man*, is described: but we may suppose, not *the Righteousness without works*. The scope of the Apostle is plainly to shew us only, that it is not by *works of the Law*, or such works as would make the reward of debt and not of grace (as appears in the immediate verses before) which are *perfect works*, that a man is justified. And he proves it by this argument, because *the man is blessed whose sins are forgiven*; that is as much as to say, not he who is without sin, but he who hath sin and it is forgiven. The man who is blessed is justified. But the man who is blessed hath sin to be forgiven. Therefore the righteousness which a man hath, or is imputed to him, is not a righteousness according to the Law of works, but according to the Covenant of Grace. This I say is the scope of the place. Gods *imputing Righteousness* to a person is indeed a phrase signifying Gods accounting him righteous or justifying him: and the Apostle Proves a man is justified *without works*, (that is perfect works) because he hath sin to be covered. I will yet repeate, The man to whom righteousness is imputed without works, is *pardoned*: but

but it followes not, that this *Righteousness without works* is *pardon*. To have righteousness imputed to a man without works, is all one as to have faith imputed to him for righteousness, so repentance or evangelical obedience, and that is not pardon, though these are never divided from the same subject. I will conclude therefore with that I have said once before, & will say it again at my parting with the point, that it is strange to me our Protestant Divines should be so offward to this cleer Determination, To wit, God judges (and will judge) all men according to the Gospel; Those who perform the condition of it, he accounts or pronounces righteous; They whom he accounts righteous, are justified. I will add, That, the righteousness of *Christ* which is the *meritorious cause* of our justification without dispute on all hands (that is the *impulsive procatartick cause*), which alwayes comes under the *Efficient*, cannot for the same reason be the *Formal*, or *Material* cause of it. It is not the *infusion of Righteousness* with the *Papist*, which is our sanctification; nor the *imputation of Christs righteousness* with the *Protestant*, which is not to be understood but *in genere causa Efficientis*; nor *remission of Sin*, with *Protestant and Papist*, which I have now bin disproving: but the imputing to a person his performance of the new covenant for righteousness, or the accounting or pronouncing him righteous according to that covenant, is the *form*, *formal Cause*, or *formal Reason* of his justification.

Do not think this strange, Justification (I will grant) *virtually* or *Eminenter* (as *unum aggregatione*) contains in it many things, and so *remission* among others (for we must find line to speak as Divines use): but Justification *Formaliter* (as *unum simplex*) I say, is only Gods pronouncing us *Just* (or sincere penitent believers), and *remission* is a *benefit* which *in order of Nature* does follow the performance of that condition.

And so I proceed to my third Paper, Of the Covenants, Of the Law and Gospel.

For the Doctrine of the Covenants. There is the Covenant of *Works* (say Divines): and the Covenant of *Grace*. The Covenant of works (say they) was made with *Adam* in his
in

integrity being that Law which is written in all mens hearts, and so requires perfection, and for the least transgression threatens Death. The Covenant of grace is made with man in his Estate fallen (or with Christ in his behalf), and requires only our Faith, repentance, and sincerity; unto Life, which being held forth under the Title of the *Promise* to *Adam*, *Abraham*, *David*, and all during the Law, was ratified by the death and blood of Christ the Redeemer under the Gospel, and so promulgated to the world, to continue still on force (and in that, as in one regard, called *new*) as long as that lasts. *Behold the dayes come saith the Lord when I will make a new Covenant, not according to the Covenant I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt.* Here is the *Old Covenant* and the *New Covenant*. The *Old* is that which God made with the Jews when *Moses* lead them in the wilderness. The *New* is that which we have under the Gospel. The *old Covenant* then is not the Covenant of *works*; for that was made with all in *Adam*, and as written in our hearts, must be eternally obligatory. But the *old Covenant* was made with the *Jews* in opposition to other Nations, and as peculiar to them is vanished, and binds not. Neither is it the Covenant of *grace* for the same reason, as also because the covenant of *grace* is the *new covenant*, but the *New* is not the *Old*. The *Old* and *New covenants* say *Divines* indeed ordinarily, are both the covenant of *grace* in opposition to that of *works*, the same in *substance*, but differing in the *Administration*. But this with *rue* is not so easy to be received without the distinction of an *A* and *The* in the case. The *Old covenant* may be a covenant of *grace*, or covenant of *works*, or both, but not the covenant of *works*, or the covenant of *grace*. There are some plead it is a *subservient* covenant as *Camero*. Some that it is a *mixt* covenant as *Ball*. Some that it is a covenant of *works* as the *Leyden Divines*. The most of our own late *Divines*, do make it a covenant of *grace*. Whereof one voluminous Authour denying the other three opinions, does yet say it was so dispensed as to tender life both upon the condition of Faith, and works. But if it proposed life on condition of perfect doing, it was a covenant of works: If on
be

believing too, a Covenant mixt both of Works and Grace : And as perfect doing was urged only in tendency to believing, a Covenant-Subservient ; and so all say true as to the main ; and yet none so distinctly true, as to leave any enquiring man without confusion in what they say. There is one thing then I apprehend will serve much for the elucidation of many difficulties in this matter, and that is to conceive aright what the Old Covenant is : And there is another like it to the same purpose, to know what kind of Covenant it was.

As for the former, we have hitherto been seeing but what it is *not* only ; now to understand what it *is*, Let us separate what *Moses* did deliver to the *Israelites*, from that which was before in promise to the *Patriarchs* as single by it self, and this is the Old Covenant. Or, take that, and all that whatsoever, and in what manner soever, that was *added* to the Covenant of Grace, which *Abraham* and the *Patriarchs* were under, and that abstracted therefrom, is I count, the Old Covenant. Let me yet speak more fully ; Take *Abraham* before he was ninety years old, when he at first Believed, and that Faith was imputed to him for Righteousness, upon which he became the Father of the faithful, while as yet he was in his Uncircumcision (for the Law of Circumcision which was after given in peculiar reference to his natural Seed the Jews, in pursuance of the temporal Benediction, is to be reckoned as Preambulatory to the Law, and belonging to it), and when you have pared away Circumcision, and all that which *Moses* commanded the Jews afterwards, from *Walk before me only, and be perfect* ; all this rest, this pared away from that, whatsoever it be, is I say, the Old Covenant, or the Law strictly taken. From this in the first place, we have light to distinguish between the Law taken *strictly* and *largely* : In regard whereof, we shall find the Apostles sometimes proving the *Righteousness of Faith* from the Law, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets ; and another time setting the Law and Gospel at the widest distance and opposition. As the Law is taken *comprehensively* for the promise to *Abraham*, as well as the Covenant made with the Jews (that is for the whole state they stood in, who were under the Law, by virtue of the Covenant confirm'd to their fore-Fa-

thers, as by vertue of that given by *Moses*), the Law and Gospel are confounded. As the Law is taken *strictly* or *precisely* for the Old Covenant, or the Law of *Moses* with Circumcision its appurtenance, that is for all that apart that was *added* to the promise before-going, and abstracted there-from as I have said, so are they distinguished, and their differences to be owned and maintained. In the next place, we may understand from this, how the Jews were under both conditions of Believing and Doing: Of *doing this and live*; and of *believing also that they might be saved*. To wit, As the Covenant of Grace was delivered to their fore-Fathers, and so on foot before, it must needs hold forth life to them on their Faith, as well as to *Abraham* their Progenitour, who received Circumcision as a Seal of *Righteousness* thereby (or to come thereby), and not by the Law, which as yet was not given. And as the Law was *added* (as the Apostle speaks) to this Covenant or Promise, it did tye the Jews to a performance of it as a condition of *living* by it, in some sense, as neither the Patriarks before, nor we since are under; and in regard whereof that which is said by a reverend person, that the *Old Testament-Spirit* was a *fearing Spirit*, with the like expressions, are not without a truth in them, that desires more consideration then *One* of late does give them: Especially when the Apostle is so expresse that the Jews were under a *School-Master*, and we are not under that *School-Master*. That the Covenant from *Sinai* engendered to *Bondage*; but where the Spirit of the Lord is, or the New Testament is, there is *Liberty*. From this yet in the third place, we may enlarge our light further, to judge of that abrogation of the Law, or deliverance from it, which Christians have under the Gospel. A glorious thing (the Apostle counts it), that puts us directly into such an estate and condition as the Patriarks, and those holy men before *Abraham* were in, to live according to the light and liberty of their Consciences, that is according to the Law of Nature, which as it is in the hands of *Christ*, and not of *Moses*, to wit, as-delivered from the Yoke of his Ceremonies, and the superstition of Idolaters, and administred with *Grace* and the *Spirit*, with *Grace* in God's acceptation of our sincerity instead of perfect obedience for the Redeemers sake, and with the *Spirit*.

Spirit in his assistance of us for the performance, is both the Universal Religion of Man-kind, and the substance of that which is Christian unto this day. I should quote *Eusebius, De prep. Evan.* See his *Ecc. Hist.* l. 1. c. 5. From whence also, we see in the way, how the Covenant of Grace which *Abraham* and all those holy men which went before him, or that ever were, have had as well as we, is yet called the New Covenant; and that is, it is called New, as the lump is called a *new lump* by the Apostle to the *Corinths*. That Church was leavened by the ill example of vicious Members, particularly of the incestuous person, they are therefore commanded to cast him out, and that they should not mingle themselves, or keep company with the scandalous, and in so doing, they should become, as it were, a new body, or lump, though they were still otherwise but the same Community. *Purge out therefore the old Leaven, that you maybe a new Lump.* So is it with the Covenant, it was made by God with all man-kind in Christ, ever since the beginning of the World, and confirmed to the Patriarchs (it being impossible esse that any should have been saved), and yet it is called a New Covenant in relation to us under the Gospel; because I say that, that which was added to it by *Moses*, to wit, all that which properly is the Old Covenant, is removed or purged away, as the Leaven in the *Jews* Feast, by Christ our Pass-over, who hath been Sacrificed, and made for us that expurgation. *And if that which is done away was glorious, how much more that which remains?* That which is done away, was the Ministration of death engraven in stone, and of the Letter that killeth; That which remaineth, is the Ministration of the New Testament, of the Spirit which giveth Life, and of Righteousness. *That which remaineth*, I pray note it, That cannot be said to remain which was not before extant. The Covenant of Grace with the Patriarchs, and the New Covenant with us, being the very same, as I have said, but ours only called New, (or renewed) upon the abolishing of that which was super-added, as upon this remaining too it self, never to wax old and vanish.

For the latter, what kind of Covenant I take this to be, I am now in order to tell you. The Old Covenant, as to me it seemeth, was a kind of Political Covenant made with the Nation of

the *Jews*, as Princes compact are with their people, when they first set up Government. God promises them his Protection, that he would lead them to a fruitful Land; overcome all their Enemies, with the like blessings; and they promise him they will be ruled by him. To this purpose did God in sundry ways appear to them to *Moses*, to their Elders, to them all in the Cloud and Fire; and then causes a Tabernacle to be made for him, which was a Keeping house among them, where the Sacrifices and Offerings was his Provision, and the Priests his Servants that lived on him; and unto that Tabernacle and Ark, might they repair for Counsel and Judgment. This People then being peculiarly under a Theocracy, which *Samuel* in two places does expressly signify (at least until the time of *Saul*), so that the Church and Common-wealth of the *Jews* were but one, according to the Apostle; it is no wonder if Religion be made their Laws, and so required of them, together with other political Ordinances and Statutes, for their happiness or publick peace as a Nation. From hence is it, that though their Law is not to be judged the Covenant of Works, or the Covenant of Grace, either of the two themselves, yet may we expect that it should represent both the one and the other to them; because in the knowledge of both does the business of Religion, and the whole of it, virtually consist. In the delivery of the Moral Law, and that with Thunder and Lightning, and such Terrour as we read of it, they had a representation of the Covenant of Nature, which *quasi* *factus* is doubtless in our false Estate a Ministration only of Wrath, or Law of sin and death. In their Ceremonial Offerings, and Priestly appointments, though there was a remembrance still of sin, and so matter of bondage and fear, yet had they types of Christ, of remedying Mercy, and the Glory to come. These Sacrifices were brought directly as Mulcts to their King, to deliver them from the danger of present punishment, being Redemptions of their lives, which else they should have forfeited by his Laws, and served, I have said, to the maintenance of his house, the Tabernacle and Temple which he was pleased to keep up among them: Nevertheless that does not hinder, but God Almighty might make use thereof, farther, for types and representations of other things, *that*

is to say *Spiritual*, and so the Law be a *Pedagogy* under a *temporal* dispensation, leading many to *Heaven*. This is certain, that the *Covenants of Nature & Grace* being made with *Man-kind*, are not matters of concernment only to the *Jews*, but to the whole world as well as to them for everlasting life and death; and it is not to be conceived, therefore, that either of them should receive any detriment by the *Covenant* made with that particular Nation. *This, I say, that the Covenant confirmed before of God in Christ, the Law which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul; that it should make the Promise of no effect.* The *Covenant of God in Christ*, is the *covenant of grace*, and that we see a-foot in the world before the Law, and before *Abraham*; for, when it was confirmed to *Abraham*, it must be in being before on necessity, and ever was since the Fall, or else none after could be saved. And if this be not disannul'd, then cannot that, whatsoever it be, which is given by this covenant, come to the *Jews* by the Law. For as the Apostle argues, *If there had been a Law given that could have given life, verily Righteousness should have been by the Law*; If the Law of Nature could be kept by man, there would be no need of a covenant of Grace by Christ: So do I argue, if Righteousness unto justification of life, was to come by the Law, the Promise, or Covenant of Grace, as soon as that was given, might be spared. But for-as-much as eternal life and justification does come only by the covenant of grace, it follows that the covenant made with the *Jews*, must needs be a covenant which concern'd their outward state, or political welfare, as I have said; and that neither Salvation nor Condemnation, as to the life to come, was the primary intention, or the direct and proper effect of it.

If Salvation, or Condemnation was the proper issue of the Law, then could neither any of those holy men as the Patriarchs, nor any of the wicked world, who were before the Law, as the men of *Sodom* and *Gomorah* be condemned at the day of Judgment: For where no Law is, there is no Transgression, and so no Condemnation. And indeed, if this covenant was conceived any other than some such thing as I make it, how could it be, that the most substantial part, or body of the *Jews*

Nation should be *Sadducees* in *Christ's* time? The Covenant of Nature is that which lays all the world guilty before God; so that *He who believes not, is Condemned already*; he is condemned by the Law of his Creation writ in his heart; he needs no outward Law to condemn him. *Whatsoever things the Law saith, saith to them who are under the Law*: If there were no Curse, nor Death, but that which the *Jews* Law doth speak, then were there none but the *Jew* should suffer Condemnation. If a man on the contrary side does believe and repent, he needs no other Law than that of the *spirit of life in Christ Jesus*, to set him free from this Law of Sin and Death. So long as he does not believe, he abides under that Wrath, and it is not for want of Faith as the cause of his Condemnation (to justify God in not giving all men that alike), but for want of it (*NB*), as that which should be the remedy, that he perishes. Salvation then, and Condemnation which is Eternal, does proceed from the covenants of grace and works; and it is not to be imagined that God should deal otherwise with the *Jews* than with the rest of the world, as to the terms of a future life. *I have set before you Life and Death*, says *Moses*. And *Cursed be he that continueth not in all the Law to do it*. But what this *Life and Death*, these *Blessings and Curses* are, we see express in *Deuteronomy*, and in the fifth Commandement. The Laws which God did give the *Jews*, were about Religion, and about Civil matters. Religion concern'd their Eternal, civil things their Temporal good. Yet whether they are commanded the observation of the one or the other, the sanction of both does lye in the threats and promises of Temporal blessings and judgments. Even as in the Laws of our Realm, Religion and the Service of God is required under a civil forfeiture, when it is the Gospel it self must threaten farther Vengeance to the Transgressor. In short, herein will lye the mystery and sum of all. The Law, as it was in the hand of *Moses*, and given to the peculiar Nation of the *Jews*, must be no other than a temporal covenant; yet did this temporal covenant contain in it *patterns of things* (as the Apostle speaks) *in the Heavens*. And as the ten Commandements particularly, written in stone, are a transcript of the Moral Law written by Nature in our hearts, I do take the Law to represent the covenant

nant of works, and by vertue of that representation alone, or of that it represents, does it operate to future judgment; and is the ministration of condemnation. The Law indeed, taken at large, for all that is contained in the whole books of the Old Testament, may be supposed to hold forth whatsoever is in the covenant of works and grace: but the Law taken separately from both, as a third covenant, cannot hold forth any other than the external government of God with propriety over the *Jews*, and that consisting in these two things, to wit, a hard task of burdensonie duties under the danger of temporal judgments, and a redress from them by Sacrifices; the one typifying our estate according to the Law of works; and the other, the grace which comes to us by Christ Jesus.

What use may be made of this, I leave to minds which are searching. I am never out of my way I count, so long as I meet with any such. Only there is *one* in a late Book, who seems to fall a little too hard on a grave Preacher for making the dispensation of the Old Testament, in some Sermons of his, to be more terrible than ours under the New: For doing which he hath thus much the more reason indeed, if (as I say) that life and death which is Eternal, comes not from the Law, but from the *Covenants of Works and Grace*, which were before it, and cannot be made voyd by it. There is therefore the *Believing Penitent* Sinner, and the *Unbelieving and Impenitent*. For the man that sins and repents not, it is true that he hath no less reason to fear under the Gospel than under the Law; but rather the more, in regard that the threatnings of the Law were directly, I take it only of temporal punishments, but the Gospel does manifestly threaten Eternal. *Of how much sorer punishment (says the Scripture) worthy he is?* But for the Penitent and Believing, the case is otherwise, and the Reprover should know it is in regard of such, that this difference is to be holden. It is true then, the Penitent Jew had the Promise to trust to as well as we, but yet he was still under the Law, and not we: and the Law it self did engender to bondage, as in the Scripture before quoted. He had the *Promise* as well as we, but he could not *look unto it* as well as we, he had a *vail* over him as we have not, that he could not *steadfastly look unto the end of that*
which

which was abolished. This is most apparent that the Jews were in the dark as to their understanding of the covenant, and Christ that End, after another manner than we are, and the more they were in the dark, the more must they be in doubts and fears, and upon this foundation is this difference built ordinarily, I suppose, by the Understanding. Nevertheless, there is yet this one thing or two farther, that under the Law, there was recourse to be had still unto their Sacrifices, which were remembrances of sin; I said before, and consequently of terrour and bondage, seeing if they failed, they had reason of fear in regard of temporal punishments, as much more then we, as they had to expect temporal blessings more then we upon their obedience, upon the account they were under a peculiar temporal covenant. Adde hereunto, These temporal things under that covenant were resemblances, patterns, and in some sence portendments of future. To what end then served the Law, says the Apostle, as you may likewise adjoyn from this supposition? *It was added because of Transgressions. The Law entered that the offence might abound.* Again, *By the Law comes the knowledge of sin;* and though sin was in the world before, men were not apt to impute it to themselves without a Law. The Law then was for the brideling the Jews from sin, and through the conviction of sin upon the Conscience, and that temporal death they saw due to them in the Beasts that were slain in their behalfs, they might be driven in the sence of their spiritual estates, to the remedying Law of Mercy upon Repentance, which is the substance of the Promise which God had given to their fore-Fathers, and has established in the Gospel. *For Christ was the end of the Law for Righteousness; and the Law was a School-master (says the Apostle) to drive us to Christ.*

For

Of the Law and Gospel.

For this Theam, I shall have need to speak the less in regard of what hath been said already. That which I have to offer, I shall serve in by way of striking light at a passage or two in a Book which hath been intended in the Chapter before, but not named. I am sensible how many there are, who being taken with the Preaching of *free grace*, are too apt to disrellish other Preachers, who press more unto *Duty*; and I think that Writer does not therefore spend his pains without good cause about the consistency of good works with the Gospel and Justification. It is objected against such Divines, that they are but Legal Preachers, and that they impeach the grace of God by putting men so much on Doing. To the one his Answer is, *They Preach not the Works of Moses Law, but the Works Christ enjoys*: To the other he tells us, *The Law and Gospel both put us upon doing, but not the same thing, nor with the same disposition*, which he explains; *The Gospel gives better rules of life, and power to do according to them, with a more willing and chearful mind than the Law did*. I will here under favour of this ingenious person, use a few words.

For the first, I look not on this Answer so jejunely, as if the meaning of the Authour was only that they preach not the *Ceremonial Law*; for who need be inform'd of that, or that the ceremonial Law does no longer oblige? But supposing the Moral Law it self coming under a double consideration, to wit, as delivered by *Moses*, and as it is in the hand of *Christ*; it is this indeed which is worth his enquiry, how the duties of the ten Commandements, or those good works which we, as well as the *Jews* are bound to perform, are obligatory in the one respect, and not in the other. Now should he have used these words, as some of our Divines do, and by the distinction intend only, we are not obliged to good works in the point of Justification, but out of gratitude to our Redeemer, or to that purpose, he must run streight into that *premunire* which he strives to avoid, to wit, of Justification by Faith only. If he

stick upon this, that the Law, as it was in the hand of *Moses*, was given for a temporal covenant, and not so as it is in the hand of *Christ*. I do not see what that does signify to the objection. This is that therefore which is to be said, and to be conceived therefore what he intends. By the works of the Law, understand we, that exact obedience which is required unto living by the Law, *Do this and live*. By the works *Christ* enjoins, let us understand that sincerity only in our obedience which God requires unto our *living by Faith*, or accepts though imperfect through *Christ*. Good works are not exacted now of any in the *first* sence, but good works are required of all in the *second*. That Preacher that should Preach obedience to the decalogue, as necessary to life in the former sence, were a *legal* Preacher indeed; but that Preacher that preaches obedience and good works in the second sence, is but a Preacher of the *Gospel*, and may not preach otherwise, as he tenders his Hearers Salvation. And behold, one came to *Christ*, and said, what shall I do that I may inherit Eternal Life? And he said to him, if thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandements. The Commandements then, I say, may be considered as the matter of the covenant of works, or our *Legal* Righteousness: or as the matter of the covenant of grace, or our *Evangelical* Righteousness. In the former sence, if any man could perform them, he should merit Eternal Life, and be sure to have it; but there is no man can keep them as they are so required. In the latter sence, there is no man but must keep them (as to the prevalent interest of his will, which constitutes integrity), and does, that ever was, and is finally justified and saved.

For the second, we have two or three things to be touched: In the first place, I do not believe (craving that Gentlemans pardon) that the Gospel gives any *better*, or any other rules of life, than what are contained in the Law. It is true that *Christ* hath instituted other Sacraments, but it is the Moral Law we call the rule of life, and that *Christ* came not to bring us the Systeme of any new Law, but to explain and establish the Law Moral (which the *Jews*, I count, and *Gentiles* both ever had, the one by the light of Nature, the other by Revelation also) is a truth something more considerable, as I take it, than that alone

lone which our Divines contend for against the Socinians in this matter. In the next place, when Divines make a difference between the Law and Gospel, as to the power of doing; that the Law *commands to do*, but the Gospel *gives power to do*; The Law commands the tale of *Brick*, but gives not *Straw*, and the like expressions: I doubt not, but they have some verity at the bottom, which should have nakedly been laid down, if he could, by this Bright person. For the delivery of things after others, by roat, without digestion, is the great fault which he finds so often in other mens Books. The Law and Gospel we know are liable to a diverse acception. By the Law most properly, I think, we are to understand that Law which is written in the heart of man by Nature, in Adams and ours; the copy whereof, is the ten Commandments, called the Moral Law: and by the Gospel, the Law of Christ; That which he delivered, and his Apostles. The matter whereof in both, may be considered *qua factus*, or *qua regula*, so use the terms of others. *Qua regula*, the things required in the Law moral, and the Gospel or Law of Christ, are the same: but *qua factus*, the Law of Nature originally requires these things in perfection, to be accepted unto life; and the Law of Christ requires them in sincerity only, accepting them, though imperfect unto life, through his Mediation and Redemption. This is the only difference that concerns us here between the Law and the Gospel. The Law then and Gospel both being considered as the Doctrine of life, how does this Authour speak, that the one gives power and not the other? The rule shews what we are to do; the power to do, is not given by our being shown. That which therefore is to be understood by such terms, may come to this; that, that which the Law thus taken (that is the Law of our Creation, and *qua factus*) does require of man, is not in our power to do, and consequently none can attain Salvation by it: but that which the Gospel requires, we have power to perform; and if we be not wanting to God's Grace, upon the performance we shall be saved. In the third place, when he says the Gospel enables us to do with a more willing and cheerful mind then the Law; if we understand this kind of speech, as those Divines do I think ordinarily that use it; in such a sense, that Christ ha-

ving done all our works for us, that Righteousness of his which was a most perfect conformity to the Law, being imputed, or accepted in our behalf for life, there are no good works now required of us to do, but only as the testification of our thankfulness, and belief of this, and therefore we perform all we do with gladness, joy, and love altogether, without bondage, fear, or doubt, it being not in order to our Justification, though we miscarry in the doing: I do apprehend this Learned Man would be one of the first to dislike such Teaching. Yet is there thus much here of truth also, That when the Law (so taken as before) does give us no heart at all to do that which *through the flesh* (as the Apostle speaks) is indeed *impossible* to any, the Gospel does give us encouragement to do, upon the account, that what it requires may be performed, and by that performance (through the assistance of God's Spirit) as the condition, Man is both justified and saved.

I know well that St. *Augustine* does use the like expressions, and I think often, but he does explain his meaning, which comes to this; that when the *Law of works* commands us what is our duty, and threatens us if we do it not, the *Law of Faith* (he counts) directs us to God for his assistance, grace, or spirit, to do what he commands. I do not forget neither, that God hath promised his spirit, and so his grace for the performance of the New Covenant; and though it does not follow, that if *Adam* had stood, he should not therefore have given man his grace and spirit for performing the *perfect* obedience of the Old, as well as to us for the performing *imperfect* under the New, seeing that Father does speak of *grace* to *Adam*, as to us; and if we should ascribe the obedience he performed, during his Innocency to his own strength, and not to the adjutory of God's spirit altogether, he would not endure it: Yet if the Authour, or those Divines of ours that speak as he does, will chose rather to make good what they say upon the contrary assertion, then can I tell how to understand with them. When God made Man at first, we know, he endued him with original righteousness. Let us suppose this righteousness alone, sufficient to him for the performing the Law, unto which he was made; so that before the fall, there was no need of that we call *grace* (which

(which is properly such help of the spirit, as consists in the healing and relief of our false estate) to enable man to do that which he had strength to perform by *nature*, until he did voluntarily defect from it. But when he was fallen, and lost that righteousness, which was his strength, then are we to conceive a need streight, both of a new Law, to be lowerd, brought down, or fitted to his weakness, that he may be *able*; and also of grace, that he may be made *willing* to perform it. And thus shall there be grace, the spirit, and the promise of it belonging to the Covenant of our Redeemer, when there was none, nor need of it, to belong to the covenant of our Creation. However, there is this I count most certain, and I would have it to be noted, that the spirit which is promised or given to man for his obedience to God, is promised and given only in respect to *this Covenant*, not for the performance of the *Covenant of Nature*, for then should *Adam* never have false, nor we have had any need of a Redeemer.

It is true, that there are some Divines are so much (with *Austin*) to have *Adams* standing (supposing he had stood) to be of grace, that they will have mans original righteousness to be a work (or habit) *supernatural*; from which, when *Adam* fell, he returned, (as they would teach us) to his *pure naturals*, and so his Posterity are born. But this is a kind of Pelagianisme, no ways to be received: For what indeed should be a Creatures *Nature*, if that be not, which it receives from its *Creation*? Besides, if mans original righteousness be not looked on as *natural*, how shall original sin, which consists in the loss of it, be defined by the *depravation* of our *nature*, according to the doctrine of the Church of *England*, as well as the Catechisme of the Assembly? Neither is Dr. *Taylor* here to be heard, who cannot abide that, that (whatsoever he will call it) which we contract from *Adam* without any will of our own, should be held to be sin, or so much as damnable, though it should be granted him through Christ's redemption actually to damn no body. It may be the want of a plainer consideration, what the immediate benefit of Christ's redemption to the world, is, made that excellent person think this so grievous. It is not grievous, I hope, that God should give a Law to his Creature according

to his nature; and that therefore having made man righteous, he should require of him to continue in that righteousness, and walk up according to it. It necessarily follows without any thing else, that this Law being made in Innocency, must condemn all man-kind, in whom this righteousness and perfection is no longer to be found; so that by nature, or according to this Covenant of mans nature, we are, and must be all the Children of wrath, as the Apostle speaks. It would now be indeed a grievous thing if God should deal with any in that justice, as he might according to this Covenant; and therefore it hath pleased him according to a *Righteousness of his* declared in the Gospel, in opposition to the righteousness of this Covenant of works, to give us his Son; who by the work of his Mediation for man-kind, should prepare a remedying Law, or universal conditional remission against that condemnation. As for Children then, if they are Baptized, we are to account they do perform this Covenant, or new Law, by the Faith of their Parents bringing them to Baptisme. *This is my Covenant you shall keep, every man-child shall be Circumcised.* If they be not Baptized, we are yet to look on them as such who have not broken this new Law, or never refused and rejected their remedy; and so long as by the Redemption of Christ, they are delivered over with all the world from the Covenant of works, to the new Law to be judged, I will not be the man that shall condemn one Infant to Hell, or unto torments; although, if there be any that will make a difference of place, or state in the future life for Children, proportionable only to the difference there is between performing the condition, and not being guilty of any breach at all of it, I will not gain-say them, nor determine any thing in a matter so lubricous, and above what is written.

To return; By the Law and the Gospel, it may be thought perhaps by some, that we are to understand the state of the Old and New Testament; and so must this Authour mentioned be made to conceive that *David*, and the like holy men, had not the same spirit or power, or not so much, to enable them to observe God's precepts, as we have now, when he uses these expressions. That the spirit was given under the Gospel as to his miraculous gifts in another measure, then under the Law. I be-

believe; and that such Texts as *the Spirit was not yet given, because Christ was not yet glorified*, and that, *they had not yet heard that there was a Holy Ghost*, with the like, may be happily so understood, I believe: But to think that the Spirit, as to sanctification of the heart, and inclining it to a ready service of God, was not given under the Old Testament as well as under the New, is a conceit I will not fasten on any. To say it is given more to us now, than to *David, Samuel, Jeremy*, and such persons in respect to this end, will yet require explanation and proof, if that be intended wholly by these speeches.

Before I pass, there is one passage of this apt Writer, I cannot but note with much approbation. It is *Grace that accepts of our Repentance, and Obedience after we have sinned*. This passage contains more in it, than the most are like to be aware of. The Scripture tells us in several Texts, that by Grace we are saved, so freely justified, and not by Works. By Works we are to understand the works of the Law, and that *quâ facta*, as before; and no body is justified or saved by these works, they being above the ability of any to perform. By Grace, I will understand, with him this accepting our sincere, though imperfect obedience for life through Christ; as if it were perfect righteousness. *Not unto him that worketh*, that is, unto him that hath not performed the works of the Law, which if they were perfect, he should live by them: *but unto him that believeth on him that justifies the ungodly*, that is, but is ungodly in reference to these works, or is one that his Conscience tells him, hath sinned, and does sin, or is imperfect, and falls short of these works, yet believes that God is gracious and merciful for all that, and will pardon these sins and failings, if he repent and walk sincerely, though imperfectly, *his Faith is imputed for Righteousness*; his Faith, that is such a believing this, as produces that repentance and sincere walking, is *imputed to him for Righteousness*; that is, is made to stand him in that stead as a perfect righteousness would do; so that through grace, or this gracious acceptance, he shall live by it. There are works (if I may still say over, what hath been somewhere also said before) that would make life to be of debt according to God's Covenant of Nature, if any could perform them, and so there are none justified or saved by works, for all have

have sinned and fall short (under this sense) *of the glory of God*. Or there are works that cannot be accepted or imputed unto life, but through grace; and so is it, that by grace only, or *gratis*, that the Scripture teaches us we are justified and saved. Nay, the acceptance of our imperfect, sincere obedience for righteousness, or that we should live by it, is that very grace it self that saves us. So well am I pleased with this Note from that Author.

If this seem to savour too much of inculcation, you must pardon me. I do apprehend that the Doctrin of grace and justification, whereof I have been, and therefore am still the longer, hath been the occasion of several apprehensions in good men, that instead of being *conducive* to, have proved but *hindrances* of, true sober practical Godliness. There are two of these mentioned by the same understanding person.

15 The one is a conceit, that a Christian may not avoyd sin, and do good, for fear of Hell, and to obtain Heaven, that is for the sake of Reward. This the Mentioner hath confuted, with plain Text, that it needs not a second hand: Onely, that it may not needlessly disquiet any, I will advance this contrary truth; that whatsoever person, out of any principle, fear, or hope, or love, does, or shall in the prevalent intentions of his Soul, and endeavour as to the constant tenour of his life, prefer his Eternal Salvation before his Flesh-pleasing in this world, is surely in a good Estate, the Converted man, or the Godly man, that shall be saved. *He that does Righteousness, is born of God*. I will suppose him a Christian, and one that acts according to the Scripture; but if he be a Heathen, and acts herein but fully up to his light, I dare not deny the same of him. And indeed, what is that pure love of God, out of which you will say alone, a man must act? *If you love me*, says Christ, who knows best, *keep my Commandments*. The love of God, and keeping his Commandments are the same. The commands of God are to be kept, that we may inherit Eternal Life, Christ tells the Ruler in the Gospel expresse (I have noted before), and consequently we may love God to that end. If man could do any good to God, by his duties, or any hurt by his sins, then should I believe there was some other end of our duty, than man's Salvation.

tion. You may say, this appears selfish, or self-love only. I answer that, that man then, who does but love himself so as to seek the Salvation of his Soul above his flesh, this world, and any thing therein, is the man he should be in the sight of God. If you stick at it, consider, what is Salvation? A loving God, a delighting in him, a conformity to him. I love God in keeping his Commandements in this life, that I may be conformed to him, and have complacency in him to all Eternity. I will adde, our Orthodox Divines say not (and are not to be so understood) that good works may not be done with respect to the reward; but with respect to the reward, as due to them *ex condigno*. For to expect that God should accept of what we do, in bearing with our failings, and rewarding us *out of Grace*; when we walk sincerely before him, is but to act our Faith on, or putting our trust in, his declared goodness, Christs Merits, and the promises of the Gospel.

The other Apprehension is, that a Christian must not *live on his own Purse or Earnings*. A pretty sound of something, which (as I suppose) does signify that which other Divines intend by *Resting in Dutys*. There is therefore a resting in *Duty*, I may say, and a resting on *God in Duty*. I doubt not but a Christian is to trust to God for whatsoever he seeks of him upon the performance of his duty, when it were but presumption to do so without that performance. It is true, that no man, by any thing he can do (seeing when he hath done all, he is but an unprofitable Servant) can deserve or merit any thing from God's hand (and much less his saving Grace, which is most free) so as it may be properly said to be earned, as wages is due unto work, or to make his blessings of debt; yet is a Christian by his prayers, and the like duty, said to get, or obtain from God whatsoever he hath from him; and as a man does live on his Estate which he gets, so may a Christian be said to live his spiritual life, upon the riches of God's grace which he gets by his duty. The want of trusting to duty therefore, in a right sense, is indeed, I doubt me, more reprobable in our Protestants ordinarily than their resting in duty. And I am seriously troubled very often, at what I have observed in some of our special practical Divines about this point of resting in du-

ties. (I will particularly name Mr. *Shepherds sincere Convert*), which is enough to bring any man Religiously melancholly (for the more pious his Soul is in the case, the more liable it must be to such strokes) into desperation. I will, therefore, say thus much in zeal against that danger. Let a man be but careful of two things about *resting* in duty, and trouble himself henceforth no more, but about the *doing* of it. The first is, Let him take heed of making any duty a pillow to lay his head on to rest in sin. Thus it is dangerous indeed to rest in duty; and this may be either when a man thinks he may sin, and go on in it, because he Prays, gives Almes, or the like; as if that would bear him out: Or chiefly, when a man shall sit down short of sincere Conversion, by doing of some duty, that is by taking up in leaving some sins, and doing many things he did not before, he shall content himself, and not come up to that universal unreferred, giving up himself to Christ, as is required of him to that sincerity of life, which is the condition of Salvation. This is the most deadly, dangerous resting in duty that I will admonish every Soul of. And then for the second, I will say only, Let him be a Protestant; which I count he is, and I doubt not but his opinion alone against merit, and that he is justified through Christ, will secure him for the rest of this business. Provided though, he remembers still that humility, and the like qualification of Soul, when he hath done all he can do, is also his duty.

And now after I have spoken of these Heads, if any be otherwise minded in whatsoever I have hitherto said, and are resolved to keep to that only which they count the soundest *Calvinisme* in them all, I will be so candid, as to lay down their doctrine for the n, to the best advantage. God hath Elected some to Salvation. Christ dyed only for them. That which he hath Purchased by his Death, is not only the benefit conditionally, but Faith it self the condition. Faith is the perswasion of a man, that Christ hath died particularly for him, and so his sins are forgiven. This perswasion, or apprehension of Christ, makes Christ ones own, and so justifies instrumentally, without works, either Legal or Evangelical. and how, also to serve this turn, I have set down in my paper of Justification, page 15. No man

man can be ever, in good earnest, thus perswaded, but the Elect, for whom alone this Faith is purchased. When a Minister then declares the Gospel, and requires of all in God's name to Believe, to wit, to believe particularly that Christ hath dyed for their sins, as knowing not, for his part, who the Elect by name be, there is no fear of hurt unto any, seeing no person on earth shall be able to be perswaded hereof indeed (that perswasion, with *Calvin* and *Luther*, being true Faith), but the Elect only. Besides, as soon as this perswasion once is but wrought, it does so possess the Soul with Love and gratitude to the Redeemer, that it constrains it to Christian duty; so that unfained Conversion, Self-denyal, a Crucifixion with Christ to the world and the flesh, and the life of God, and that with perseverance to the end, do follow as naturally (to wit, according to the *new Nature*) as the Fig-tree brings forth Figs, or the Olive, Olives, without all possibility of separation from it. This Doctrin, if any will so concatenate the parts, does seem to me to carry a kind of mysterious authority in it, that I find some awe for it at my heart, although really, I am convinced both of the danger of it, and also (excepting only in the first proposition) that it is untrue. So far am I from despising of those, against whom the spirit of that Authour, in the book intimated, seems so much over-sharpened: when yet I do encline in my own sentiments to hang things together, much rather after his fashion, than theirs, who would look upon me as more Evangelical, in such a Determination.

Deo Gloria mihi Condonatio.

J. H.

ERRATA.

PAGE 16. l. 21. for *desires* read *deserves*. p. 18. l. 7. for *Clouds* read *Cloud*.